

**FILED**

**MAR 16 2006**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

AGHVAN GHAHRAMANYAN;  
SEDIK BABLANTAN,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-76077

Agency Nos. A95-588-437  
A95-588-438

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 8, 2006<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: CANBY, BEEZER, and KOZINSKI, Circuit Judges.

Aghvan Ghahramanyan and his wife Sedik Bablantan, natives of the former  
Soviet Union and citizens of Armenia, petition for review of the Board of

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be  
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without  
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Immigration Appeals’ order summarily affirming an immigration judge’s (“IJ”) decision denying their application for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). We have jurisdiction pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial evidence, and may reverse only if the evidence compels a contrary conclusion. *Chebchoub v. INS*, 257 F.3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 2001). We deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the IJ’s adverse credibility determination because the IJ identified inconsistencies within Ghahramanyan’s testimony and between his testimony and his asylum application that went to the heart of his claim regarding his involvement with his church, where his children were living, and when he suffered persecution in Armenia. While “alleged inconsistencies in dates that reveal nothing about a petitioner’s credibility cannot form the basis of an adverse credibility finding,” *Bandari v. INS*, 227 F.3d 1160, 1166 (9th Cir. 2000), here Ghahramanyan could not consistently recount the year in which one of the two incidents upon which he bases his claim occurred. *See Chebchoub*, 257 F.3d at 1043 (upholding adverse credibility determination where inconsistencies were not minor and related to basis of fear of persecution). In the absence of credible testimony, the petitioners failed to establish eligibility for asylum,

withholding of removal, or CAT relief. *See Farah v. Ashcroft*, 348 F.3d 1153, 1156-57 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**